

Application No. 10/582,265  
Amendment Dated August 11, 2010  
Reply to Office Action of May 11, 2010

#### REMARKS

The Office Action mailed May 11, 2010 has been carefully considered by the Applicant. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments to the specification and claims.

#### Drawings

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's attention to detail regarding the drawings. The Examiner is correct that all of the drawings for this application are presented on sheets 1-4.

#### Specification

The specification has been amended to delete improper references to the claims.

#### Claim Objections

Claims 1-14 have been objected to for informalities.

Claims 8 and 12-14 are hereby cancelled.

Claims 1-7 and 9-11 are amended in accordance with the suggestions set forth in the Office Action. No new matter is added by these changes.

Withdrawal of the claim objections is thus appropriate and requested.

#### Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 1-14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite.

As stated above, claims 8 and 12-14 are cancelled.

Claims 1-7 and 9-11 are hereby amended to overcome the rejections under §112.

If the Examiner has further concerns regarding the definiteness of the claims in this application, he is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney by telephone.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-3, 6, 11 and 12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Korber et al U.S. Patent No. 7,047,890 in view of Korolainen Finnish Patent Document No. 77967. Claims 4, 7, 8 and 13 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Korber et al '890 in view of Korolainen '976 and further in view of Johnson et al U.S. Patent No. 5,377,951. Claims 5, 9, 10 and 14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Korber et al '890 in view of Korolainen '976 and further in view of Lechman U.S. Patent No. 6,092,883.

Claims 1-7 and 9-11 are amended to further define over the references cited in the Office Action. No new matter is added.

Claims 8 and 12-14 are hereby cancelled.

Claim 1

Claim 1 recites:

*wherein turning of the first pivot joint makes the bearer pivot for reduction of an angle between the display and a vertical plane as the keyboard panel travels from the working position to the storage position.*

This aspect is not disclosed in the prior art, including the references cited by the Examiner. Contrary to the Examiner's interpretation, Korber et al '890 teaches differently from claim 1 by disclosing a work station configured such that movement of a sliding input device platform 30 from a working position to a storage position increases an angle between the display 14 and a vertical plane.

In addition, claim 1, as amended, recites:

*a front cover mounted removably or permanently on the swing arm and wherein the front cover is adapted to swivel together with the swing arm thereby protecting the display.*

As stated by the Examiner, Korber et al '890 fails to disclose this combination of structure. However, contrary to the Examiner's analysis, Korolainen '576 also fails to disclose this structure. Korolainen '576 does not disclose that the front cover 8 is attached to swing arms. Rather, the front

cover is attached to side walls 9 which are completely separate (i.e. not configured to *swivel together with the swing arm*). In fact, each of elements 6, 7, 8 and 16 in Korolainen '576 is separately movable with respect to each other.

Further, there would have been no reason to make the combination proposed by the Examiner. According to Korber et al '890, the storage position of the display is parallel to and adjacent with a horizontal level defined by the lower surface of table 12. Placing a front cover, such as disclosed in Korolainen '576, into the table of Korber et al '890 would have no purpose whatsoever. Such a cover would not protect the display and would not provide more space for legs for a desk with limited dimensions in terms of depth when the keyboard panel is in its stored position. This is because the stored position in Korber et al '890 is the horizontal orientation shown in Figure 7. There simply would be no motivation and no reason for one skilled in the art to modify arrangement of Korber et al '890 in the manner suggested by the Examiner.

Claim 1 is therefore believed allowable.

#### Claim 2

Claim 2 is also believed allowable for the reasons stated above regarding claim 1. Claim 2 also recites that *movement of the keyboard panel is transmitted by a second pivot joint to the front cover for reduction of an angle between the front cover and the vertical plane, as well as a front cover beneath the keyboard panel, wherein the front cover and the display bearer have bottom portions thereof linked to each other by a horizontal first pivot joint.*

Thus for the reasons stated above, claim 2 is believed allowable.

#### Claims 3-7 and 9-11

Claims 3-7 and 9-11 depend from one of claims 1 and 2. As such, these claims are believed allowable for the reasons stated above, as well as for the subject matter recited therein.

Application No. 10/582,265  
Amendment Dated August 11, 2010  
Reply to Office Action of May 11, 2010

Conclusion

The present application is thus believed in condition for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

ANDRUS, SCEALES, STARKE & SAWALL, LLP

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Peter T. Holsen", written in a cursive style.

Peter T. Holsen  
Reg. No. 54,180

100 East Wisconsin Avenue, Suite 1100  
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202  
Phone: (414) 271-7590  
Fax: (414) 271-5770